IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ROBERT YOUNG, : CIVIL ACTION

: NO. 15-1830

Petitioner,

.

V.

:

SUPERINTENDENT DIGUGLIELMO,

et al.,

:

Respondents.

## ORDER

AND NOW, this 24th day of June, 2016, upon review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge David R. Strawbridge (ECF No. 19), and only general objections having been filed, it is ORDERED as follows:

(1) the Report and Recommendation is APPROVED and ADOPTED;

A prisoner may object to the magistrate judge's report and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); E.D. Pa. R. 72.1(IV)(b). The Court must then "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court does not review general objections. See Brown v. Astrue, 649 F.3d 193, 195 (3d Cir. 2011) ("We have provided that § 636(b)(1) requires district courts to review such objections de novo unless the objection is not timely or not specific." (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Petitioner's objections here - asking the Court to review whether "the [magistrate judge] err[ed] when [he] denied Petitioner's Writ of Habeas Corpus Petition" and whether "the [magistrate judge] err[ed] when [he] failed to issue a certificate of appealability" - are entirely general, as he does not identify any specific errors committed by Judge Strawbridge. The Court's mandate is to review specific objections, not to search the record for potential errors. Accordingly, the Court will not review Petitioner's objections de novo.

- (2) The Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 1) is DENIED and DISMISSED with prejudice;
- (3) A Certificate of Appealability shall not issue; and
- (4) The Clerk of Court shall mark this case CLOSED.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.